

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, 21-27, 29-35, 37-53, 55 and 56 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44 being independent. Claims 4, 12, 20, 28, 36 and 54 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, 32, 33, 37 and 40-49 have been amended and Claims 55 and 56 are newly-presented herein.

Claims 25, 33, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Claims 25, 33, 43 and 44 have been amended to be directed to a computer-readable storage medium or a program stored on a computer-readable medium, as appropriate. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection are requested.

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-20, 25-28, 33-36 and 41-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,013 (Ota et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,947 (Suzuki). Claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 21, 23, 29, 31, 37 and 39 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Ota et al. and Suzuki, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,936 (Hirabayashi). Claims 6, 8, 14, 16, 22, 24, 30, 32, 38 and 40

were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Ota et al. and Suzuki, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,816 (Van Buren et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With the present invention, since the host computer, in response to the notification from the printing apparatus, stops generation of print data and sends a predetermined data to the printing apparatus, the printing apparatus can quickly start the next print job and shifting the sequence of print data can be prevented.

Ota et al. is directed to an image data storing system including a video capture controller that can capture raw video image data from a peripheral unit and provide compressed video image data to a document image management server. Ota et al. is not directed to a technique between a printing apparatus and a host computer sending print data to the printing apparatus. Referring to column 13, lines 16-18 of Ota et al., if a shutdown occurs before a job is completed, i.e., before all pages of the document of the job have been captured, the job is aborted and none of the previously captured raw video image data is stored in order to ensure file integrity. However, with the present invention, the printing apparatus and host computer can work even if a print cancellation instruction is inputted. The present invention is irrelevant to a “shutdown” as described in Ota et al. Moreover, it is not apparent from Ota et al. whether a print cancellation is inputted at the side of the multi-function digital copier peripheral unit 10.

Accordingly, Ota et al. fails to disclose or suggest, at least, in response to the print cancel instruction, stopping a current printing process and notifying a host computer of print cancellation, to cause the host computer to stop generation of print data and output predetermined data, and, after issuance or input of the print cancel instruction, deleting the print data received until the predetermined data is received from the host computer, as is recited in independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 33.

Nor does Ota et al. disclose or suggest, at least, while generating and sending print data to a printing apparatus, determining whether or not a notification of print cancellation has been received from the printing apparatus, and, if determined that the notification of print cancellation has been received, stopping generation of the print data, and transferring predetermined data indicating a break of the print data, deleted after issuance of the notification of print cancellation from the printing apparatus, to the printing apparatus, as is recited in independent Claims 41-44.

Thus, Ota et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

The remaining citations have been reviewed, but are not believed to remedy the deficiencies of Ota et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 41-44. Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, 21-24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34, 35, 37-40, 45-53, 55 and 56 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW/agm

DC_MAIN 227041v1